	Case 1:19-cv-01797-ADA-GSA Docume	ent 66	Filed 10/27/22	Page 1 of 3
1				
2				
3				
4				
5				
6				
7				
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT			
9	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA			
10				
11	NATHANIEL MARCUS GANN,	No.	1:19-CV-01797-	ADA-GSA (PC)
12	Plaintiff,			FINDINGS AND
13	v.		OMMENDATIC	
14	VALLEY STATE PRISON, et al.,			X TO CLOSE CASE
15	Defendant.	(ECI	F Nos. 49, 61)	
16				
17	Plaintiff Nathaniel Marcus Gann ("Plaintiff") is a state prisoner proceeding pro se and in			
18	forma pauperis in this civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The matter was referred			
19	to a United States Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302.			
20	On July 12, 2022, the assigned Magistrate Judge issued the findings and			
21	recommendations, recommending that Defendants' motion for summary judgment for failure to			
22	exhaust administrative remedies be granted. (ECF No. 61.) On September 26, 2022, Plaintiff			
23	filed objections to the findings and recommendations. (ECF No. 65.)			
24	In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636 (b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 304, this			
25	Court has conducted a <i>de novo</i> review of this case. Having carefully reviewed the entire file,			
26	including Plaintiff's objections, the Court finds the findings and recommendations to be			
27	supported by the record and proper analysis.			
28		1		
	1	1		

Case 1:19-cv-01797-ADA-GSA Document 66 Filed 10/27/22 Page 2 of 3

As Plaintiff's objections largely reiterate the arguments raised in his opposition to the motion for summary judgment, the Court finds no basis to overturn the findings and recommendations. First, Plaintiff argues that his first appeal, which was the group appeal, should not have been cancelled. (ECF No. 65 at 2.) The Court agrees with the Magistrate Judge that upon cancellation of the group appeal, Plaintiff was required to file an appeal individually, setting forth a specific set of facts that are unique to his appeal pursuant to Title 15 of the California Code of Regulations section 3084.2(h)(4). (ECF No. 61 at 49.) Therefore, the Court finds that Plaintiff's first appeal was correctly cancelled at the first level of review and the cancellation properly instructed Plaintiff to file an appeal individually.

Second, Plaintiff argues that his second appeal was wrongfully rejected because he was instructed to file the appeal as an individual and the body of his second appeal is sufficient to comply with the exhaustion requirement. (ECF No. 65 at 2.) The Court agrees with the Magistrate Judge that Plaintiff was required to file an appeal individually, stating the specific set of facts that are unique to his issues with Defendants' alleged non-compliance with the Jewish Kosher Diet Program ("JKDP"). (ECF No. 61 at 53.) Therefore, the Court finds that Plaintiff failed to show that she exhausted her administrative remedies with respect to his second appeal.

Third, Plaintiff argues that his third appeal was wrongfully rejected because Defendants have not provided any evidence that indicates that further appeal would not have been rejected. (ECF No. 65 at 3.) Plaintiff further asserts that no further remedy was available and that no further appeal on the Kosher issues could be filed. (*Id.*) The Court agrees with the Magistrate Judge that Plaintiff's third appeal exhausted all three levels of review, but the appeal concerned the cancellation decision of the group appeal, not the substantive claims with respect to the JKDP that Plaintiff brought forth in his complaints in this action. (ECF No. 61 at 57.) Therefore, the Court finds that Plaintiff failed to exhaust his administrative remedies for the claims at issue in this case.

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

Case 1:19-cv-01797-ADA-GSA Document 66 Filed 10/27/22 Page 3 of 3 Accordingly, 1. The findings and recommendations, (ECF No. 61), are ADOPTED IN FULL; 2. Defendants' motion for summary judgment, (ECF No. 49), is GRANTED; 3. Defendants' motion to dismiss, (ECF No. 48), is DENIED as moot; 4. This action is DISMISSED, without prejudice, for failure to exhaust administrative remedies before filing suit; and 5. The Clerk is directed to CLOSE this case. IT IS SO ORDERED. Dated: October 26, 2022